



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/699,103

11/03/2003

Stewart H. Sonnenfeldt

112025-0755U

3714

24267 7590 12/23/2009  
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP  
88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE  
BOSTON, MA 02210

EXAMINER

TIV, BACKHEAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2451

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/23/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/699,103	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SONNENFELDT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> BACKHEAN TIV	<b>Art Unit</b> 2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/15/09.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 29 and 36-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-28 and 30-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 29 and 36-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Detailed Action***

Claims 1-14,29, 36-43 are pending in this application. Claims 15-28, 30-35 have been cancelled.. This is a response to the Amendment/Remarks/RCE filed on 10/15/09.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7,12,29,36-38,40,43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2003/0072429 issued to Slobodin et al.(Slobodin) in view of US Publication 2002/0103864 issued to Rodman et al.(Rodman) in further view of US Patent 7,234,116 issued to Watanabe et al.(Watanabe) in further view of Office Notice.

As per claim 1, Slobodin teaches where a phone connection exists over a telephone network between a first phone of the host party and a second phone of the attendee party(Figs.3-12, para.0010); the first adaptor also coupled to the first computer(Figs.3-12); a second adaptor which is coupled to both the second phone and the second computer(Figs.3-12,para.0084); receiving a start meeting command at a first adaptor coupled to both the first phone and the first computer(para.0039, Fig.7,8,9); and

in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing the first adaptor to initiate a meeting(Fig.12, para.0051).

Slobodin however does not explicitly teach a method for initiating an online meeting over a data network between a host party with a first computer and an attendee party with a second computer; receiving, at the first adaptor from the first computer, a meeting identification that was generated by the data center; storing the meeting identification at a requesting conference endpoint, transmitting the meeting identification from the requesting conference endpoint over the telephone network to a remote conference endpoint; causing by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center;

Rodman teaches a method for initiating an online meeting over a data network between a host party with a first computer and an attendee party with a second computer, (Fig.1, para.0011), the method comprising: receiving a meeting identification from the data center(para.0012; conference code); storing the meeting identification at a requesting conference endpoint(para.0012), transmitting the meeting identification from the requesting conference endpoint over the telephone network to a remote conference endpoint(para.0013).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Slobodin to include sending meeting identification as taught by Rodman in order to establish data conferencing sessions between two or more geographically remote conference site(Slobodin, para.0002).

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Rodman and Slobodin in order to establish data conferencing sessions between two or more geographically remote conference site(Slobodin, para.0002).

Slobodin in view of Rodman explicitly teaches in response to the first adaptor receiving the start meeting command, causing the first adaptor to initiate a meeting(Slobodin, Fig.12, para.0051), however does not explicitly teach, causing by the first adaptor, the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center; and receiving, at the first adaptor from the first computer, a meeting identification that was generated by the data center.

Watanabe teaches causing the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center(Fig.7, col.12, lines 61- col.1340; teaches start up message sent to the server which is interpreted as the start meeting message).

Taking in to consideration, The Supreme Court in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_, \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-97 (2007) identified a number of rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness which are consistent with the proper “functional approach” to the determination of obviousness as laid down in Graham. The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Slobodin in view of Rodman of the method of a

Art Unit: 2451

first adaptor receiving the start meeting command and the first adaptor initiating a meeting based on the receive command to instead of the first adaptor initiating the meeting, sending the command to a computer to cause the first computer to send a start meeting message over the data network to a data center as taught by Watanabe in order to start an online meeting.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Rodman, Slobodin, and Watanabe in order to start an online meeting.

Rodman does teach receiving a meeting identification that was generated by the data center, para.0012. Slobodin, claim 1, recites “a data conference control unit connected to the telephone adapter and the network interface, the data conference control unit adapted for communication with the local display device, that data conference control unit implementing a negotiation procedure that obtains a network access code”, suggests that the data conference/adaptor receives some network access code for conferencing. Slobodin in view of Rodman in further view of Watanabe does not explicitly teach sending information/ID from a computer to the first adaptor.

Office Notice is taken; the methodology of sending/receiving information/data from one device to another is well known. This method can be applied to sending from a computer to a first adaptor. The prior art of record teaches setting up a conference with the use of the adaptor and a computer receiving meeting identification from a server.

Taking in to consideration, The Supreme Court in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_, \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-97 (2007) identified a

Art Unit: 2451

number of rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness which are consistent with the proper “functional approach” to the determination of obviousness as laid down in Graham. The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.

To send the meeting identification from the computer to the adaptor would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art since this method is merely sending data from one device to another. Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Slobodin in view of Rodman in further view of Watanbe of a setting up a conference with the use of the adaptor and a computer receiving meeting identification from a server to send the meeting identification from the computer to the adaptor in order to set up a conference with the use of the adaptor(Slobodin, claim 1, Abstract).

As per claim 2, the method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving the meeting identification into the second adaptor from the telephone network(Rodman, para.0013, Slobodin, Figs.3-12); and causing by the second adaptor, the second computer to send a join meeting message over the data network to the data center(Rodman, para.0013, Slobodin, Figs.3-12). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 3, the method of claim 1, wherein the telephone network comprises a public switched telephone network(Rodman, para.0011, Slobodin, para.0042).

Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 4, the method of claim 1, wherein the data network comprises an Internet(Slobodin, para.0020). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 5, the method of claim 1, further comprising:  
encoding the meeting identification by the first adaptor prior to transmitting the meeting identification over the telephone network to the second adaptor(Rodman, para.0043).

As per claim 6, the method of claim 5, wherein the second adaptor receives the meeting identification by monitoring the phone connection to detect the encoded meeting identification(Rodman, para.0043).

As per claim 7, the method of claim 6, wherein said encoding converts the meeting identification into a dual tone multiple frequency (DTMF) signal(Rodman, para.0043).

As per claim 12, the method of claim 1, further comprising: a third party with a third computer joining the meeting using a third adaptor which is coupled to both a third phone and a third computer(Slobodin, Figs.3-12). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

Slobodin in view of Rodman in further view of Watanabe, does not teach as per claim 37, a codec operable to encode the meeting identification prior to transmission of the meeting identification over the telephone network to the second apparatus. Rodman, para.0043, does teach encoding for conference invitation.

Office Notice is taken; it is well known to one ordinary skill in the art to use codec for encoding data.



Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Slobodin in view of Rodman in further view of Watanabe to include codec to encode data in order to provide security for meeting identification.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Rodman, Slobodin, and Watanabe, Bear and the use of codec to include codec to encode data in order to provide security for meeting identification.

As per claim 40, the apparatus of claim 36, wherein the plurality of interfaces include a USB interface operable to couple the apparatus to the first computer and RJ interface operable to couple the apparatus to the first phone(Slobodin, Figs.13-14).  
Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 29,36,38, 43 do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 1-7,12 . Therefore claim 29,36,38, 43 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 8-11,13,14,39,41,42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2003/0072429 issued to Slobodin et al.(Slobodin) in view of US Publication 2002/0103864 issued to Rodman et al.(Rodman) in further view of US Patent 7,234,116 issued to Watanabe et al.(Watanabe) in further view of Office Notice.) in further view of US Patent 6,959,072 issued to Lee.

Slobodin in view of Rodman in further view of Watanabe in further view of Office Notice does not explicitly teach as per claim 8, the method of claim 1, further

Art Unit: 2451

comprising: initiating an audio recording of the meeting by user input on one of said adaptors.

Lee teaches initiating an audio recording of the meeting by user input on one of said adaptors(Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Slobodin in view of Rodman in further view of Watanabe in further view of Office Notice to include recording and playing audio messages as taught by Lee in order to provide audio information to people.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Rodman, Slobodin, Watanabe, and Lee in order to provide audio information to people.

As per claim 9, the method of claim 1, further comprising: recording audio of the meeting from the phone connection through one of said adaptors to the computer coupled thereto(Lee, Abstract). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 8.

As per claim 10, the method of claim 1, further comprising: recording audio of the meeting from the phone connection within flash memory of one of said adaptors(Lee, Abstract). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 8.

As per claim 11, the method of claim 1, further comprising: enabling a privilege-to-record field for the attendee prior to allowing an audio recording of the meeting by way of the second adaptor(Lee, Fig.5A, col.5, lines 34-48). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 8.

As per claim 13, the method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving an audio message from the data center and playing the audio message to one of said parties(Lee, Abstract). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 8.

As per claim 14, the method of claim 13, wherein the audio message includes instructions relating to the meeting(Lee, Abstract). Lee teaches the use of audio messages, therefore it is obvious to one ordinary skill in the art that a person can record any kind of audio message. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to record instructions relating to a meeting in order to provide users information.

As per claims 39,41,42, do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 8-11,13,14 . Therefore claims 39, 41,42 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14,29, 36-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

**Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing

responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

**Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BACKHEAN TIV whose telephone number is (571)272-5654. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2451

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

B. T.  
Backhean Tiv  
Examiner, Art Unit 2451  
12/17/09

/Hassan Phillips/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2451